

Shirlee Herrington**IO11**

From: Aimee Doran <aimeeshootingstar@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 7:58 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Save Tahoe forests

Hello,

I am a 12 year resident of the North Lake Tahoe area. I value my community and its surrounding wilderness. I strongly oppose the Martis Valley West project. I believe it is widely inappropriate for our area and would end up being not only an eye sore (light pollution, sky line inhibitor etc) but a devastation to our already troublesome forest habitat. It would add more traffic on an already congested roadway, erosion on surrounding trails would be irreversible and the fire danger and pollution added is not something that our current infrastructure could handle. I believe this project is profit driven for few and not economy driven for many. Please consider with your hearts and minds to rescind this irresponsible proposal.

IO11-1

Thank you for your time,
Aimee Doran

Concerned citizen
Placer County, Tahoe Vista work, Olympic Valley home

IO11**Aimee Doran
December 21, 2015**

IO11-1

The comment expresses opposition to the MVWPSP project and concerns regarding light pollution, sky line, forest habitat, traffic, trail erosion, fire danger, and pollution. The comment does not specifically address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR, however. All issues raised in the comment are addressed in the document. Light pollution and visual resources are addressed in Chapter 9, "Visual Resources." Forest habitat is addressed in Chapter 5, "Land Use and Forest Resources," and Chapter 7, "Biological Resources." Traffic is addressed in Chapter 10, "Transportation and Circulation." Trail erosion is addressed in Chapter 17, "Public Services and Recreation." Wildland fire effects are addressed in Chapter 18, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials." Please also see Master Responses 4 and 9 of this Final EIR, which address visual resources and wildland fire and emergency evacuation, respectively. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

From: MaryAnn Dresner [<mailto:maryanndresner@att.net>]
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2015 4:23 PM
To: Stacy Wydra
Subject: Martis Valley

IO12

to: Stacy Wydra:

I understand that you are the planner in charge of the current Martis Valley project for Placer County. I am writing about that project, and if I am writing to the wrong individual, please either forward this email or respond to me with the email address of the correct individual or entity.

Although I am a resident of the city and county of San Francisco, I have spent many , many hours and days and weeks enjoying all that the Tahoe and Martis Valley area have to offer.

I have read the EIR for the proposed Martis Valley project.

I am opposed to the Martis Valley project as proposed, because

1- I do not think that there is a need for more residences in the Tahoe area

2- The light from the residences and commercial establishments proposed will pollute the darkness and wilderness feeling that comes over the Tahoe and Truckee area at night.

3- I would like to see more stringent height limitations on the proposed buildings

4- I am concerned about the traffic that the new buildings will engender because

a. there is already way too much traffic in the Tahoe Truckee area, particularly during the summer months, as there is only one road around the lake, and should a fire or other disaster occur, the access out of the Tahoe basin is limited.

b. the traffic and the pollution from the traffic serves to cast sediment in Lake Tahoe

The last item is of particular interest to me, because I swim and Kayak regularly in Lake Tahoe. Every motor vehicle which is used in the Tahoe area spews pollution into the lake, albeit involuntarily.

Please let me know if there are any further meetings which I can attend. I was not able to attend previous meetings because of my work schedule.

thank you,
Maryann Dresner

IO12-1

IO12-2

IO12-3

IO12-4

IO12-5

IO12-6

I012	MaryAnn Dresner December 18, 2015
<hr/>	
I012-1	The comment expresses opposition to the MVWPSP. The comment lists a series of concerns, but does not specifically address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR.
I012-2	The comment expresses concern that the project would result in light pollution that would affect night skies. Project-related impacts to scenic vistas and light and glare were thoroughly evaluated and determined to be less than significant, as described in Draft EIR Impact 9-1, "Adverse effects on scenic vistas," and Impact 9-4, "New sources of light and glare." The project would, however, contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable light and glare impacts, as discussed in Cumulative Impact 9-9.
I012-3	The comment suggests that more stringent height limitations should be imposed on the proposed buildings. Table 3-3 of the Draft EIR presents the maximum proposed building heights (see the Development Standards in Appendix B of the Specific Plan). The MVWPSP is designed to be compatible with the scale and character of the area, consistent with the MVCP (Policy 4.A.4) and with the <i>Placer County Design Guidelines Manual</i> , and the Design/Development Standards contained therein.
I012-4	The comment notes that there are existing unacceptable transportation operations that would become worse if the proposed project is implemented and raises concerns regarding emergency evacuation. Chapter 10, "Transportation and Circulation," of the Draft EIR includes discussions of the existing traffic conditions and an analysis of potential future conditions under the proposed project. Please see Master Response 9, which addresses emergency evacuation.
I012-5	The comment expresses concern with air pollution and sediment deposition in Lake Tahoe, due to project-related traffic increases. First, as analyzed throughout Chapter 11 of the Draft EIR, with mitigation implemented, construction and operation of the MVWPSP would not exceed Placer County Air Pollution Control District significance thresholds (both at the project level and in the cumulative condition). The majority of vehicle-related pollutants that enter Lake Tahoe are from vehicle sources within the Lake Tahoe Basin (Lahontan and NDEP 2008:72). Airborne fine sediment from sources outside the Tahoe Basin, such as the MVWPSP, would be deposited before they reach Lake Tahoe (Lahontan and NDEP 2008: 53-55). Thus, the 65 to 70 percent of vehicle trips associated with the project that would not enter the Lake Tahoe Basin would not affect Lake Tahoe water quality. Furthermore, project-related vehicle trips that would enter the Lake Tahoe Basin would be consistent with the total vehicle miles travelled that were accounted for in the development of the Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load pollutant load reduction strategy. As such, all vehicle trips up to the VMT threshold standard have already been accounted for in a science-based regulatory program that provides a comprehensive strategy to achieve Lake Tahoe water quality standards.
I012-6	The comment requests notice of additional project-related meetings. The commenter has been added to the email distribution list to receive notifications of future hearings.

I013

Thomas G. Duffy
Barbara A. Duffy
3454 La Playa Drive
Davis, California, 95618

Supervisor Jennifer Montgomery
Supervisor Jack Duran
Supervisor Robert M. Weygandt
Supervisor Jim Holmes
Supervisor Kurt Uhler,

December 21, 2015

Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: Opposition to the Martis Valley West Project

Dear Members;

The purpose of this letter is to request that you deny the approval of the Martis Valley West Project (Project) as proposed. We base this request upon the following:

1. The Project will, if approved, commence construction while California and the Lake Tahoe Basin are in the worst recorded drought in history thus adding greater burden to water supply management in the region. The project will unnecessarily stress the water supply system that state level directives currently require be reduced by 25% from baseline usage;
2. The Project as planned will impact the ridgeline above the northwest area of Lake Tahoe through light pollution where we now have the equivalent of a “dark sky policy” in planning practice. The glare from lights in homes and from the campgrounds proposed will destroy the night time beauty of Lake Tahoe and the sky above the Lake;
3. The Project will add to traffic impacts along the east and west access of Highway 167 due to the high number of new residential units planned and especially so during high volume days and weekends as day use visitors access the mountain resort; and
4. Finally we question how traffic from the Project in emergency circumstances such as forest fires and seismic events will be able to move quickly and safely from the project area in that ingress and egress are limited.

I013-1

I013-2

I013-3

I013-4

In conclusion we thank you in advance for your consideration of our concerns and ask again that you deny this project as presented

Sincerely,

Tom Duffy

I013	Tom Duffy December 21, 2015
<hr/>	
I013-1	The comment expresses concerns related to water supply. Water supply is evaluated in Draft EIR under Impact 16-1, “Increased demand for water supply.” As discussed under this impact, the groundwater budget indicates that groundwater resources are sufficient to meet forecasted demand (including the proposed MVWPSP) from the aquifer, and the demand would be within the 32,000 acre-feet per year (including groundwater and surface water diversions) allowed to be extracted/diverted pursuant to the Truckee River Operating Agreement. For further discussion related to water supply concerns and drought, please see Master Response 8.
I013-2	The comment asserts that the MVWPSP would result in light pollution that would affect night skies in Lake Tahoe. As evaluated in Draft EIR Impact 9-4, “New sources of light and glare,” light sources from the project would not be visible from Lake Tahoe and would not create a new source of substantial light that would adversely affect views in Tahoe. As discussed in Cumulative Impact 9-9, while future projects could result in new sources of light and glare visible from nearby recreation areas or the Lake Tahoe Basin, the MVWPSP would not substantially contribute to these effects. Therefore, the MVWPSP would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts from light and glare visible from nearby recreation areas or the Lake Tahoe Basin. Please also see Master Response 4, which discusses the visual resources evaluation methodology used in the Draft EIR. Please note that although the comment refers to proposed homes and campgrounds, the proposed project does not include campgrounds. The Brockway Campground project is a proposal for which environmental review has not yet commenced; see Master Response 2.
I013-3	The comment notes that there are existing unacceptable transportation operations that would become worse if the proposed project is implemented. See Draft EIR Chapter 10, “Transportation and Circulation,” which describes the existing conditions and potential traffic and circulation effects associated with the MVWPSP.
I013-4	The comment raises concerns regarding emergency evacuation. Please see Master Response 9 of this Final EIR, which addresses this issue.

Shirlee Herrington

I014

From: Lanny Fisk <lanny@paleoresource.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 8:27 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Hugh@PaleoResource.com; Brendan@PaleoResource.com; Dave@PaleoResource.com; david@paleoresource.com
Subject: RE: Comments on the Martis Valley West DEIR

17 November 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

I have reviewed the Draft EIR for the Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan and find that the assessment of potential impacts to paleontological resources (fossils -- the remains of prehistoric plants and animals) is **grossly inadequate**. Mitigation is required to protect potential impacts to paleontological resources to be consistent with Placer County General Plan Goal 5.D: "*To identify [and] protect...Placer County's important . . . paleontological . . . sites and their contributing environment.*" Therefore, I encourage the Placer County "*decision-makers*" not to adopt this DEIR without adequate mitigation that will reduce impacts to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level as required by CEQA.

The DEIR did not even assess potential impact to paleontological resources but instead erroneously concluded that: "*there is no evidence of any sensitivity for paleontological resources in the MVWPSP project site.*" And, "*The MVWPSP project site is not underlain with sedimentary rock formations of a type that could contain fossils.*" And "*Significant paleontological resources or sites are not likely or expected to occur in the project area and no impact to unique paleontological resources or sites would occur.*" All three of these statements from the DEIR are blatantly false. I do not know what professional paleontologist drew these grossly inaccurate conclusions, but whoever did was woefully ignorant of both the geology and paleontological potential of the Martis Valley area. Not only is there evidence identifying sensitivity for paleontological resources in the area, but fossils have been previously reported and the area has high sensitivity to produce more scientifically significant and important fossils. Most (but not all) of the area is underlain with sedimentary rock formations of a type that could (and does) contain fossils. Significant paleontological resources are expected to occur in the project area and impacts to paleontological resources are likely to occur. The DEIR could not have got it more wrong. Even worse, the DEIR states on the bottom of page 8-11: "*Geologic and soil conditions in the region are characterized by deep granite bedrock....*" All one has to do is compare this statement with DEIR Geology and Soils section 14.1.1 on page 14-1 to see that this statement is total fabrication, written by someone who did not even bother to read the Geology and Soils section. On page 14-1 the geology is described as being composed of Miocene and Pliocene volcanic and volcanoclastic rocks overlain by Quaternary glacial and alluvial deposits.

I014-1

Rock formations in the Martis Valley area that will be impacted by excavations proposed as part of the proposed Martis Valley West Specific Plan include Miocene volcanoclastic rocks referable to the Mehrten Formation that have produced abundant highly significant vertebrate and plant fossils such as those found at the canyon of the Truckee River north of the project area (University of California Museum of Paleontology records). In addition, proposed excavations will impacted Quaternary (Pleistocene and Holocene) sediments that contain an important record of glacial "Ice Age" and post-glacial faunas, floras, and paleoclimates. These Quaternary sediments are prime candidates for preserving vertebrate fossils, such as mastodons, antelope, and horses that were found at the Boca Reservoir north of the project area (University of California Museum of Paleontology records). In my professional opinion, both the Miocene Mehrten Formation and Quaternary sediments have a **high potential** to produce significant paleontological resources during excavations for the proposed Martis Valley West development.

The DEIR for the proposed Martis Valley West project did not follow the "**Standard Procedures**" of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (attached), nor the "**Best Management Practices**" (attached) for assessing and mitigating impacts to fossils. The SVP, a national scientific organization of professional vertebrate paleontologists, has established standard procedures that outline acceptable professional practices in the conduct of paleontological resource impact assessments and mitigation. Most practicing professional paleontologists adhere closely to the SVP's assessment and mitigation requirements as specifically spelled out in these standard procedures. The SVP's standard procedures were approved by a consensus of professional paleontologists and are the standard against which all paleontological resource impact assessments and mitigation programs are judged. Many federal, state, and county regulatory agencies have either formally or informally adopted the SVP's standard procedures for the mitigation of construction-related adverse impacts on paleontological resources, including both federal (FERC, USFS, BLM, NPS, etc.) and state agencies (CEC, CPUC, Caltrans, etc.). I seriously doubt if the person who wrote the statements on paleontological resources has the qualifications required to do so by the SVP, nor the qualifications required by the BLM and USFS.

IO14-1
cont.

Important fossils may be unavoidably impacted by this Project. However, the DEIR proposes no mitigation measures to protect these fossil resources. Consequently potentially significant impacts will not be reduced to a less-than-significant level as required by CEQA. Mitigation measures for protecting paleontological resources should be added before the EIR is adopted or the EIR should only be adopted contingent on adding mitigation measures for protecting paleontological resources to be consistent with SVP standard procedures. **Placer County has a rich fossil record, which needs to be protected and preserved for future generations to study and enjoy. Once the record of the past has been destroyed, it will be gone forever. The fossil record needs to be preserved now.**

Before the EIR for this project is adopted, **I suggest that the FEIR should adopt SVP's Standard Procedures for the mitigation of construction-related impacts on paleontological resources.** SVP mitigation measures are the standard against which the adequacy of all paleontological mitigation programs are judged. Use of SVP standard procedures will result in mitigation for this project being consistent with Placer County General Plan Policy 5.D.7: "*The County shall require that discretionary development projects are designed to avoid potential*

impacts to significant paleontological or cultural resources whenever possible. Unavoidable impacts, whenever possible, shall be reduced to a less than significant level and/or shall be mitigated by extracting maximum recoverable data.” SVP standard procedures will insure that impacts to paleontological resources resulting from project construction are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the inaccurate, inadequate, and unacceptable assessment of potential impacts on paleontological resources. I sincerely hope that my criticism of this DEIR receives proper attention and results in fossils being preserved, not only on this project but on others as well.

IO 14-1
cont.

Respectfully,

Dr. Lanny H. Fisk, PhD, PG

Professional Mitigation Paleontologist and California licensed Professional Geologist



IO14

Dr. Lanny H. Fisk
November 17, 2015

IO14-1

The comment suggests that there is evidence identifying sensitivity for paleontological resources in the project area, that fossils have been previously reported, and that the area has high sensitivity to produce more scientifically significant and important fossils. The comment also states that most (but not all) of the project area is underlain with sedimentary rock formations of a type that could (and does) contain fossils.

As stated in Chapter 8, “Cultural Resources,” of the Draft EIR, no recent discoveries of paleontological resources have occurred in the project vicinity and there is no evidence identifying any sensitivity for paleontological resources in the project area. The comment refers to one paleontological find. In 1993, a mastodon was found near Boca Reservoir in Nevada County, approximately 5 miles northeast of Truckee. The mastodon is hypothesized to have originated from an even more northerly location and was relocated in a glacier that slowly moved into the region.

Also, as stated in Chapter 8, the project area is not underlain by sedimentary rock formations of a type that is likely to contain fossils. Geotechnical reports prepared for the project indicate that most of the East and West Parcels are underlain by Miocene aged volcanic rock primarily composed of andesite and volcaniclastic deposits. Volcaniclastic deposits refers to clastic volcanic material ejected from volcanoes and generally includes ash (fine silt), cinder scoria (sand and gravel), and bombs.

A small area of alluvium is mapped along Monte Carlo Creek (northeast corner of East Area). The alluvium likely consists of an unconsolidated mixture of silt, sand, gravel, cobbles, and some boulders. The project would not result in disturbance of this area.

The comment notes a discrepancy to the characterization of soil conditions between Chapter 8, “Cultural Resources,” and Chapter 14, “Geology and Soils.” The characterization on page 8-11 is a regional characterization, as opposed to the site-specific characterization of Chapter 14. The text on page 8-11 has been modified, as follows, to provide clarification:

As described in the Initial Study prepared for the MVWPSP (see Appendix A of this Draft EIR), there have been no recent discoveries of paleontological resources in the region and there is no evidence of any sensitivity for paleontological resources in the MVWPSP project site. ~~Geologic and soil conditions in the region are characterized by deep granitic bedrock with typically shallow surface soils. The project site is underlain by Miocene aged volcanic rock primarily composed of andesite and volcaniclastic deposits. Volcaniclastic deposits refers to clastic volcanic material ejected from volcanoes and generally includes ash (fine silt), cinder scoria (sand and gravel), and bombs. A small area of alluvium is mapped along Monte Carlo Creek (northeast corner of East Area). The alluvium likely consists of an unconsolidated mixture of silt, sand, gravel, cobbles, and some boulders.~~ The MVWPSP project site is not underlain with sedimentary rock formations of a type that could contain fossils. In addition, past glacial movement in the area has resulted in significant movement and disturbance of rock and soil, further minimizing the potential for fossils to be present. Significant unique paleontological resources or sites are not likely or expected to occur in the project area and no impact to unique paleontological resources or sites would occur. Therefore, this issue is not discussed further in this Draft EIR.

Although there is a possibility that soils might be encountered that could contain fossil materials, the overall geological conditions in Martis Valley are poor for significant fossils. This conclusion is consistent with analyses performed for other projects located in the

immediate vicinity of the project site, at sites that exhibit similar geologic conditions. For example, the EIR prepared for the Northstar Mountain Master Plan involves ground disturbance elsewhere in the area, at locations with similar geologic settings. The EIR concluded that paleontological resources are unlikely to be present in the area. There is no record to indicate that, during the construction of projects in the area (e.g., Northstar Highlands, Northstar Village), paleontological resources were encountered. Generally, for a fossil to be part of a significant paleontological resource, it needs to be within its somewhat original context (e.g., with other bones from the same organism, associated with identifiable geological strata, and the like). Geologic and soil conditions in the region were created, in part, by geologic uplift and past glacial movement in the area has resulted in significant movement and disturbance of rock and soil, further minimizing the potential for fossils to be present. Therefore, it is unlikely that the project would involve excavation into volcanoclastic rock that may have paleontological resources, and the conclusions of the Draft EIR are not changed. However, in an abundance of caution, Mitigation Measures 8-2b and 8-2c on page 8-13 of the Draft EIR are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 8-2b: Develop and implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program

Prior to improvement plan approval, the project applicant shall design and implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) that shall be provided to all construction personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter and alter heritage and cultural resources. The WEAP shall be submitted to the Planning Services Division and shall describe, at a minimum:

- ▲ types of heritage and cultural resources expected in the project area;
- ▲ types of evidence that indicate heritage or cultural resources might be present (e.g., ceramic shards, trash scatters, lithic scatters, mineralized, partially mineralized, or unmineralized bones and teeth, soft tissues, shells, wood, leaf impressions, footprints);
- ▲ what to do if a worker encounters a possible resource;
- ▲ what to do if a worker encounters bones or possible bones; and
- ▲ penalties for removing or intentionally disturbing heritage and cultural resources, such as those identified in the Archeological Resources Protection Act.

Mitigation Measure 8-2c: Stop work in the event of an archaeological discovery

In the event that evidence of any paleontological, prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities (e.g., ceramic shard, trash scatters, lithic scatters, mineralized, partially mineralized, or unmineralized bones and teeth, soft tissues, shells, wood, leaf impressions, footprints), all ground-disturbing activity in the area of the discovery shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. The Placer County Planning Services Division and the Department of Museums will be notified of the potential find and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to investigate. If the find is an archaeological site, the appropriate Native American group shall be notified. If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the CRHR standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, the Planning Services Division shall

be notified and a data recovery plan shall be prepared. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find is determined to constitute either an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist shall work with the project applicant to avoid disturbance to the resources, and if complete avoidance is not feasible in light of project design, economics, logistics, and other factors, follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard DPR Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System office for the project area (the NCIC).

I015

From: Michael Garabedian [<mailto:michaelgarabedian@earthlink.net>]

Sent: Sunday, November 22, 2015 1:55 AM

To: Maywan Krach; Placer County Environmental Coordination Services

Subject: Martis Valley West Parcel DEIR and Draft Specific Plan (DSP) zoning map questions and comment

Maywan,

Thank you for the opportunity to present Martis Valley West Parcel points as questions, comments and suggestions.

1. Missing zoning maps

I am unable to find a map in the DEIR or DSP that shows lands currently zoned as timberland preserve (TPZ) on project and project area lands, including and particularly in Placer County. For example, DEIR Exhibit 3-3 "Existing Zoning" does not show TPZ on the west parcel, and therefore its title seems to be incorrect or misleading. Similarly, there apparently is no ability to determine whether there is TPZ zoned land "within one mile of the exterior boundary of the land upon which immediate zoning is proposed. PRC 4621.2.(a)(2).

I015-1

2. Analysis of ability to meet findings required for immediate TPZ Rezoning/Conversion

I am also unable to find in the DEIR consideration of the findings required to TPZ immediate rezoning/conversion of TPZ, e.g., PRC 4621.2; GC 51120 and 51121.

3. Immediate TPZ cancellation alternatives analysis

The FEIR does not include consideration of requesting a ten-year roll-out of TPZ for the project.

I015-2

We recommend immediate issuing and recirculation of a CEQA document with each of these items disclosed and analyzed. They are basic to the project and essential for public comment making. If we are missing something or incorrect, please let us know.

Michael Garabedian, President
Friends of the North Fork
916-719-7296

IO15	Friends of the North Fork Michael Garabedian, President November 22, 2015
<hr/>	
IO15-1	<p>The commenter requests specific information from the County and requests that the EIR be recirculated. The comment states that there is no map depicting land currently zoned as timberland preserve (TPZ) [sic] and no ability to determine whether there is TPZ-zoned land within one mile of the exterior boundary of the land upon which immediate zoning is proposed. As discussed in Draft EIR Chapter 2, “Executive Summary,” Chapter 3, “Project Description,” and Chapter 5, “Land Use and Forest Resources,” the East and West Parcels are currently zoned Timberland Production Zone (TPZ), not Timberland Preserve Zone, as suggested by the comment. Existing zoning is discussed and explained narratively on pages 2-1, 3-1, 3-9 through 3-12, 5-1 through 5-4 and under Impacts 5-3 and 5-4 beginning on page 5-21 of the Draft EIR. Adjacent forest-zoned land is also shown on Exhibit 3-3 and Exhibit 5-1, “Existing Zoning.” Please see response to comment IO16-7 regarding the analysis of the conversion of forest land and timber harvest zone (see Impacts 5-4 and 5-5, pages 5-23 through 5-28 of the Draft EIR) and the procedures related to an immediate rezoning of TPZ lands (Sections 51130-51146) (see Draft EIR pages 5-10 and 5-11). Please also see Master Response 1 addressing the criteria for recirculation of an EIR.</p>
IO15-2	<p>The comment states that the EIR does not include consideration of a ten-year rollout of the TPZ for the project. As stated, the MVWPSP does not propose a 10-year TPZ rollout, but rather proposes an immediate rezone of TPZ on the West Parcel resulting in an immediate rollout. The immediate rezone of TPZ land on the West Parcel must be approved by the County Board of Supervisors, and would be subject to findings required by the Timberland Production Act. If the Board of Supervisors does not approve the immediate rezone, then the land could be rezoned pursuant to a 10-year rollout, as suggested by the commenter. This approach would affect the timing of the effective date of the rezone. See response to comment IO16-8 regarding analysis of the immediate rezoning of TPZ proposed by the MVWPSP. In addition, see Master Response 10 regarding additional suggestions for project alternatives. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter’s opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.</p>

I016

FRIENDS OF THE NORTH FORK

6755 Wells Avenue
Loomis, California 95660

December 22, 2015

Stacy Wydra, Project Planner
Environmental Coordination Services
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn
California 95603
cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Re: Matris Valley West Parcel Project
October 2015 Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan Public Review Draft
Timber Production Zone cancellation and forest conversion
Draft Environmental Impact Report comments

Dear Ms. Wydra:

Friends of the North Fork (Friends) submits the following comments on the Matris Valley West Parcel Specific Plan (SP) Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

Friends incorporated in 2005 to protect the beauty and renewable natural resources of the North Fork American River canyon. A significant part of Friends' work has been and is in the form of efforts to help Placer County land use proposal analysis and decision making.

INTRODUCTION

In 2010 as a result of the efforts of a number of people and groups, including Friends which came on board to the opposition started earlier by the other groups, the Placer County Board of Supervisors (Board) denied the immediate Rezone of the Bunch Creek Timberland Production Zone Property (PREAT 20060521). The Martis Valley West Project (Project) and the SP Review Draft proposal to immediately cancel the West Parcel TPZ threatens to undo the denial of the Bunch Creek rezone and to undermine Timberland Production Zoning in Placer County and throughout California.

What, exactly, is the "exchange" project?

The project is mislabeled as an exchange. It is nothing of the sort. An exchange would, for one example that should be included in the DEIR as a project alternative, be to put a conservation

I016-1

I016-2

easement on the West Parcel that defines what could and could not already be done on it. However, there is no exchange proposed to put a development development limiting conservation easement on it. Instead of an exchange, we have a proposal inconsistent with the County General Plan by destroying the forest use on the West Parcel as part of an effort to prevent development of another area that is also currently in forest use. Instead of the two areas that are now in forest use, only one would be left.

The project has insufficient private and public environmental and planning management. This appears in general and from the vague and internally contradictory content of the SP. The SP proposes a kind of West Parcel SP “island” different from Placer County planning that applies everywhere else, but appears to proposed the use County Staff to administer it at public expense.

Caution is needed to assure that the SP and DEIR process do not become private party planning that trump public planning processes. The process should not become an after-the-fact ratification of a private process.

IO16-2
cont.

Development of the East Parcel must be a DEIR project alternative. The premise of the proposal is that West Parcel development is better than East Parcel development; if so, then let the alternative analysis of East Parcel development begin. Based on reviewing the SP and DEIR, it is not unreasonable to speculate for purposes of having the DEIR analyze development of the East Parcel as a CEQA project alternative, that development of the West Parcel is an outcome that is preferred by developers to East Parcel development. Part of this posit is that the “limited” conservation easement (“LCE”) protection for the East Parcel is a carrot being held out (stated to be in escrow now) to accomplish a different primary goal near Brockway Summit. Protection of the East parcel is conditional and may not happen before 2020 or at all after that. SP page 65.

IO16-3

A CEQA violation has already occurred for the Project in the County’s clouded Minor Boundary Line Adjustment process

An indicator of this project being outside the ability of public management is the recent Minor Boundary Line Adjustment (MBLA) that appears to be necessary to implement the Project that was approved by the Parcel Review Committee with a CEQA exemption at its September 1, 2015, special one agenda item repeat Lake Tahoe meeting. County Planning staff recently wrote to the Planning Commission for the Stafford-Pantell MBLA appeal from the Parcel Review Committee that MBLAs are between the applicant and the County. This candid statement about a non-disclosure and non-analysis MBLA process seems accurate: besides CEQA exemptions even for riparian area MBLAs, Planning refuses to do staff reports on MBLAs. Friends research has disclosed the fact that MBLAs have been involved in creating the most damaging existing and potential eyesore visual impact houses of affecting the Auburn State Recreation Area canyon recreation. MBLAs can create vast increases in the value of the parcels involved in a non-public and extremely limited planning process. It is not evident how much more than technical zoning tech check is done on MBLAs.

IO16-4

This is the return of this important piece of the SP and Project to the September 1, 2015 Parcel Review Committee agenda after inadequate notice for the first time it was approved:

“RECONSIDERATION OF MINOR BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT (PLN15-00086) SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 5

(MONTGOMERY) Minor Boundary Line Adjustment on Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 110-050-009-000, 110-050-034-000, 110-050-065-000, 110-050-029-000, 110-050-030-000, 110-050-031- 000, 110-040-020-000, 110-060-056-000, 110-060-062-000, 110-060-065-000, 110- 060-067-000, 110-060-029-000, 110-060-030-000, 110-060-031-000 and 110-060-060- 000 to reconfigure the subject parcels. The properties are zoned TPZ (Timberland Production) and are located at 4699 Northshore Boulevard in the Truckee area. The Planning Services “Division contact for this project, Stacy Wydra, can be reached at (530) 581-6288.

“NOTE: This item was scheduled and approved by the Parcel Review Committee on August 5, 2015. The County was subsequently notified of an alleged failure to notice members of the public of the hearing who requested the same. The Parcel Review Committee Chairman will reconsider his/her August 5, 2015 action by rescinding the August 5, 2015 action, conducting a public hearing on the matter and reconsidering the August 5, 2015 action based on testimony and evidence received during the September 1, 2015, public hearing.”

Northshore Boulevard is Highway 267, and the parcels affected include parcels in the West Parcel area.

This MBLA is part of the project definition of this SP and Project DEIR that are the subject of this comment. In spite of fair arguments that this and other MBLA projects may have a significant impacts of the environment, it proceeds with no CEQA. Here the DEIR was already in preparation. This and the SP and DEIR suggest that the project is already out of and far outside of needed environmental management requirements as well as common sense.

I016-4
cont.

SPECIFIC PLAN LANGUAGE REQUIRING DEIR IDENTIFICATION, ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION

The major DEIR environmental issues are:

- TPZ rezoning
- Fire prevention
- Fire protection
- Only one year-round resident access road to and from the development area. Two road access points the accepted standard; the absence of this including associated environmental impacts require explanation.

I016-5

- Modified county planning and zoning regulation and modified administration of planning and zoning. This includes the SP administrative decision making apparatus which makes it unclear how resident and public environmental concerns can be addressed once and after development starts.
- It's not possible to understand the SP including its BASICS nor can the DEIR be commented on without first reading all 155 pages of the plan and appendixes because necessary information is scattered throughout. To acquire the necessary understanding also appears to require knowing the Martis Valley Specific Specific Plan, the Northstar Community Service District master plans, the Truckee River Operating Agreement and much more Page 45.
- Maintenance of permanent review copies of the SP FEIR available to the public in a public location.
- Without adequate explanation, other issues could be added to this major problems list.

IO16-5
cont.

If it is not withdrawn, the SP is in need of radical substantive modification including major re-write throughout the text and appendices. At minimum, a SP re-write is needed first before proceeding with CEQA.

Friends here covers SP language that requires the SP and Project are to go forward. However, major consideration in a new and recirculated DEIR is necessary. The need for a new or any DEIR or EIR effort could avoided if the SP and Project are denied or withdrawn.

1. Authors. Identification of the SP authors and what "A collaborative conservation and development endeavor" is. Front cover and missing title page.¹
2. Ecology. There is no stated nor is involvement evident of the use of the various ecological sciences and ecologists in the designing the Project and SP including development areas and infrastructure. It is too late to bring them in now after the fact. They need to be involved from the beginning. See page 25 buffer designations and throughout. This applies to the buffer designation on page 25 and throughout, including recognition for all intermittent watercourses.
3. Project topographic and watershed/hydrologic maps. The SP and DEIR need to have topographic maps with contour and section lines covering the entire West and East Parcels and their environs. Wider impression of the topography including in relation to proposed development and infrastructure is not possible based on the maps provided. Watershed and other maps (pages 49-53) are needed to allow comparison of the East and West parcels.

IO16-6

¹ The use of the MBLA process without CEQA on the part of project proponents may define what collaboration means and doesn't mean.

4. West Parcel elevations. The community is proposed to be created at an elevation of 6,600 to 7,800 feet. Examples of similar, larger or smaller communities thriving environmentally with acceptable environmental impact at these elevations in the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe region are required, and if not here, from elsewhere. Page 10. The average approximate population of 1,900 people is projected which is about the population of Colfax that is at 2,425 elevation on I-80 at State Highway 174 and is on the continental railroad. The West Parcel is projected to have approximately 190 year round residents. Page 30. Truckee is 5,817 elevation. Tahoe City 6,250 elevation with the moderating Lake Tahoe influence. Brockway Summit is 6,266 elevation.
5. Geographic relationship to Northstar. According to the SP, the West Parcel development is a “logical extension” of the existing community west of SR 167 which apparently refers to Northstar. Page 18. But there is no direct year-round connection between Northstar land and the West Parcel. West Parcel occupants would need to exit to Highway 167 and proceed from there to Northstar. Page 32-34.
6. Road standards. What are the percent grades on the access road and on the Primary Emergency Access Road towards Brockway Summit? Pages 36 and 79.
7. East Parcel limited conservation easement. The vision of the “permanent placing over 6,700 acres of land into conservation” is not supported. A “limited conservation easement” is proposed without explanation. Will and does this mean that the easement will be of perpetual duration and meet the other requirements of California Civil Code section 815 and the the California Constitution of being an enforceable restriction? The “LCE” that is currently in escrow needs to be made public. Page 18.
8. Conversion of West Parcel forestland. The proposal does not encourage the sustained productive use of all forestland. How the project would not lead to the the destruction of forest land and TPZ on the West Parcel and beyond is needed. Page 18. State approval of the conversion would require CEQA disclosure, analysis and mitigation, but the DEIR wholly fails as a CEQA document for a conversion.
9. Incompatible uses on continued West Parcel TPZ. Keeping part of the West Parcel TPZ is proposed on 390 acres or 325 acres as stated with uses incompatible with forest management, but the uses planned are incompatible with ongoing TPZ and forest management. Top of page 24 and throughout the SP and DEIR. “Facilities” for timber harvesting are permitted, an odd use of language for 390 acres of forest land “Improved campgrounds” are allowed. Page 27.
10. Employee housing density exemption. Policy LU-HS5 excludes employee housing from being counted towards calculation of maximum density. End of page 30. This makes density, unit number and population predictions environmentally and planning-wise

I016-6
cont.

meaningless. It suggests the creation of an unregulated employee colony of unlimited size and location.

11. Gated community. Will the roads be access controlled or not, what are the factors that will influence the decision, and when will the decision be made? How would access be controlled. Page 38. What is the mechanism for the public to access trail heads? Page 38.
12. Multiple EVAs. Primary , secondary partial year, and additional multiple internal cul-de-sac Emergency Vehicle Access ways are to be provided. Page 42. The need for these require explanation
13. Waterways. Intermittent episodic water courses need to be added to the plan and drainage study limitation to intermittent ephemeral streams. Page53.
14. Fire protection and fire separation from law enforcement. Fire prevention and protection are one of the two most important environmental impacts of the proposal. They are so distinct from law enforcement that it is inappropriate to lump them together.
15. Fire prevention and Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). The DEIR must examine and mitigate the SP and Project's significant contributions to wildland fire risk. The SP and DEIR do virtually nothing that is minimally necessary and widely recognized to address fire prevention and impacts of the proposal on fire prevention and vegetation including forest impact for the project and the surrounding area. DEIR pages 18-9 to 18-10.

DEIR Exhibit 9-26, "Conceptual Site Plan Used to Simulate Buildout of the Project Site," DEIR page #-31, demonstrates absence familiarity with the most basic fire wise land development: (a) there is no buffer of any kind for HOA maintenance of, for example, a shaded fuel break, between wildlands and structures which break could delay or stop a fire from the east or that fire starts from development areas; (b) many structures on the east and south of the building area are located above slopes either at the crest, or below the crest and on the slope in the most dangerous fire behavior vulnerable positions; (c) a fire in the reservoir canyon has slopes that can carry embers to the ignite the structures; (d) nearly all structures are on an east to west rising slope that could carry fire through the community; (e) structures appear to be so close together that if one burns it could ignite neighboring structures (structures ignite others within 30 feet; wind conditions exacerbate this). To summarize, if there was an intention to design a community to create conditions for another fire like the Boles Fire that recently burned through residential structures in Weed, Exhibit 9-26 could be it.

I016-6
cont.

A new and revised DEIR must require, and the SP needs to be modified as necessary to include:

- Mandatory contact with and then name the individual fire marshall serving the area of the projects, what certification training and experience they have, the name and address of the organization they work for, the consultation that has taken place with them including their site visit, and a copy of or listing of their recommendations for the proposal.
- To contact the Placer County Fire Mitigation Coordinator and identify all fire prevention projects in the Project area and region.
- A map of the present Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) in the Project area and region and what the new WUI would be with the project.
- Map all Project and area fire history of fires since at least 1946, including year perimeters and acreage, structures lost, deaths or injuries, and so on, and major fires before that.
- Map the September 2014 King Fire, its 17-plus mile leap in one day, the period of time that it posed a potential threat to Squaw Valley, Tahoe City, Truckee and areas beyond including the Project area, the fire lines that were being bulldozed and prepared seven miles from Squaw Valley and describe up to 15,000 fire fighters and 100 bulldozers were fighting it when it was most threatening.
- Describe and map Project and surrounding area fire hazard ratings.
- Require that all structure and infrastructure development be designed and located considering and in accordance with topography, fire behavior.
- Require HOA permanent funding and creation and maintenance of permanent up to 300 foot shaded fuel break buffers inside the West Parcel boundaries for around all parcel development.
- HOA CC&R's that mandate defensible space and its expansion due to topography, HOA enforcement HOA, and the ability of any resident to take legal action upon the failure of any property owner or the HOA to perform their fire prevention or enforcement responsibilities.

IO16-6
cont.

16. Fire protection. A new DEIR must and the SP must be modified as appropriate to:

- Reference any applicable existing Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) and how it is applicable to the project.
- The Fire Protection Plan (FPP) is not described in the SP (Page 57) and should be changed to a CWPP.
- If it doesn't exist, before project design, require preparation of a CWPP for the Martis Valley area including the East and West Parcels.
- Describe Project and surrounding area insurance rating, and availability of insurance in the area.
- Reference and incorporate into the project the Fire Safe Regulations adopted by the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection including those that go into effect January 1, 2016, 14 CCR 1270.

- | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review SP requirements of consistency with the Northstar Community Service District ordinances and definitions. These should be compared in the DEIR mandatory and non mandatory requirements of similar nature regarding Policies PSU-21 to PSU-25. Mandatory requirements should be incorporated into the SP and FEIR. Nonmandatory requirements should be compared, and the most appropriate one selected and with a explanation of the choice. | <div style="border-left: 1px solid black; height: 80px; margin: 0 auto; width: 2px;"></div> | IO16-6
cont. |
| <p>17. <u>Timber Production Zone immediate rezone or TPZ 10-year rollout.</u> The DEIR must examine and mitigate the demonstrably significant impacts on the forest and area environment on the both the Martis Valley side of the rim and the Lake Tahoe side of the rim that the TPZ plan and project TPZ termination would have. This includes the need to protect and address wildlife, watershed and recreational purposes if the California Timber Productivity Act and California Constitution Article XIII, Section 3(j) on which the law is based. This provision of the Constitution is the source of TPZ taxation not being based on property valuation. The purpose of this Constitutional provision is for “restricting the use of timberland to the production of timber products and compatible uses.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SP makes none of the necessary findings and environmental analysis required for either immediate TPZ cancellation of TPA 10-year rollout. SP Pages 60, 65-66, 69-70. The SP gives no necessary attention to the findings and environmental analysis that must be made for either an immediate TPZ rezone or a ten year TPZ rollout, The DEIR does not address the environmental impacts of either method of TPZ termination. As is proposed here, a landowner who has “taken advantage of the substantial benefits created by the state to achieve the sweeping practice of forest practice reform” should not be easily allowed to “opt” out of the system. <u>Clinton v. County of Santa Cruz (1981)</u> 119 CalApp3d 927, 932. Both immediate cancellation and 10-year rollout must be consistent with the General Plan. Either would violate the General Plan, and are impermissible. The DEIR dose not provide the disclosure, analysis and mitigation of environmental impacts for either cancellation method. | <div style="border-left: 1px solid black; height: 180px; margin: 0 auto; width: 2px;"></div> | IO16-7 |
| <p>18. <u>The impermissible failure to evaluate the SP and Project for their consistency with the County General Plan is a fatal DEIR flaw.</u> The absence of consistency analysis suggests at minimum inattention to planning and at worst the absence of an overarching planning effort by the SP and its proponents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The (a) rezone, (b) replacement of forest land with a single massive isolated housing cluster with no internal open space (Exhibit 9-26), (c) location of a community structure on the development areas high elevation that is the peak of a promontory over steep slopes on its north and east sides with what appears to 360 degree views, and (d) the promontory community facility | <div style="border-left: 1px solid black; height: 100px; margin: 0 auto; width: 2px;"></div> | IO16-8 |

higher than and within feet of the “Adopted TRPA Boundary” that is below it, are obviously inconsistent with the Placer County General Plan. Regarding point (d), this project that looks oddly outside TRPA’s jurisdiction even though it affects Lake Tahoe; the General Plan nonetheless applies.

- County General Plan Policies 7E.1. through 7.E.6. implement Goal 7.E. “To conserve Placer County’s forest resources, enhance the quality and diversity of forest ecosystems., reduce conflicts between forestry and other uses, and encourage a sustained yield of forest products.”
- There is no mention of Policies 7.E.3. through 7.E.6. DEIR Appendix D, page D-53.
- Policies 7.E.1. and 7.E.2. are printed on DEIR page D-54 without analysis. Instead, the rationale for the distinctly different Policy 6.D.8. is cross-referenced. 6.D.8. is, “The County shall require new development to preserve natural woodlands to the maximum extent possible.” SP and Project do not “encourage sustained productive use of forest land as a mean of providing open space and conserving other natural resources,” or “discourage development that conflicts with timberland management” as required by Policies 7.E.1. and 7.E.2., but the 6.D.8. explanation also does not maximize woodlands to the maximum extent possible.
- The rezone is clearly inconsistent with the General Plan’s recognition of the area as a scenic resource and its Goal 1.K. which is “To protect the visual and scenic resources of Placer County as important quality-of-life amenities for county Residents and a principal asset in the promotion of recreation and tourism. The rezone is inconsistent with Policy 1.K.1. to protect scenic areas like the watersheds, scenic highway corridors, ridgelines and steep slopes on and around the West Parcel by requiring new development to be planned and designed in a manner which employs design, construction, and maintenance techniques that avoid locating structures along ridgelines and steep slopes. The DEIR consistency analysis does not address this goal and policy. Page D-47.
- Amending the County General Plan is mentioned in the proposal without explanation regarding forest and scenic requirements that the DEIR erroneously, and without necessary and even with no analysis, determines that the West Parcel TPZ rezone are consistent with replacing the forest with housing, and beacon community building.




I016-8
cont.

19. Timber Production Zone early cancellation. The SP makes none of the necessary findings required for either immediate TPZ cancellation or TPZ 10-year rollout. SP Pages 60, 65-66, 69-70. The DEIR fails to assess and address these required absences noted here.

- The County and State can not factually or legally make the required finding that the immediate rezoning is not inconsistent with (a) the California Constitution or the Timberland Productivity Act, or (b) the the immediate rezoning is in the public interest.

I016-9

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defined requirements for immediate termination in California Code of Regulations, 14 CCR section 1109.2 prevent making a public interest finding because the termination (a) has to serve a public need and provide a public benefit, (b) cannot have an adverse impact on the environment (for example, the severity of the project's adverse fire impacts could not possibly be overlooked by Cal Fire), (c) can not have an adverse impact of the California's long-term timber supply including cumulative impact from conversion of similar properties, (d) has land is available for the proposed new use outside the existing TPZ and on TPZ land with lower quality timber than the proposed parcel. • To meet the objectives of the TPZ statute, immediate rezones must find that the timberland, recreational and environmental objectives of the TPZ law are substantially outweighed by some other public interest objective that would be served by immediate rezone. <u>Sierra Club v City of Hayward</u> (1981) 28 Cal.3rd 840, at 857 on analogous required Williamson Act contract cancellation public interest finding. • The SP does not make and the DEIR does not environmentally review the necessary findings required for either immediate TPZ cancellation of TPA 10-year rollout. SP Pages 60, 65-66, 69-70. • Cal Fire can not under Public Resources Code section factually or legally make the findings that conversion is in the public interest. The conversion from forest must not have a substantial and unmitigated effect on continued timber growing use or open space use of other land zoned for timberland preserve and situated within one mile of the exterior boundary of the land proposed for immediate rezoning including the portion of the West Parcel if it remains in TPZ. Public Resources Code section 4621.2 prohibits conversion for uneconomic character of existing use. | <p>IO16-9
cont.</p> |
| <p>20. <u>Timber Production Zone 10-year rollout.</u> As noted, a 10 year rollout is inconsistent with the County General Plan. The General Plan must be amended to permit a 10-year rollout. Further, the failure of the DEIR to event address this consistency issue is an obstacle to 10-year rollout, as are other major failings of the DEIR. TPZ rezone would develop remote forest lands with timber, biological and scenic resources. Wildfire would threaten new and existing land uses.</p> | <p>IO16-10</p> |
| <p>21. <u>Visual impacts from existing trails such as the Rim Trail do not appear to have been evaluated in or for the DEIR.</u> SP page 78. DEIR Chapter 9.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Rim Trail parallels the development area for up to and possibly more than two miles of its length and typically under half mile from proposed development, but trails of its importance a the length of the trail itself do not appear to be on the radar of the development proponents, the SP, or the DEIR. | <p>IO16-11</p> |

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DEIR has no, but needs, graphic and text presentation of the structures and the varying building heights that are allowed up to the very, and unusually high for such an area, 75-foot structures. | 
I016-12 |
| <p>22. <u>Identifying and addressing ecological relationships between the East and West Parcels is impermissibly left to very partial effort in the future.</u> There is no known or possible basis for the SP statement that species habitats would be protected “by designating the entire East Parcel and a portion of the West Parcel as forest, which would preclude extensive development.” SP page 76. Indeed, the potential relationship between the parcels for deer migration is left to the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both parcels together constitute a biome with current zoning for development and a proposed development area, and they should be treated as such instead of the separate SP and DEIR treatments. • The topographical relationships between the two parcels alone suggest a variety of ecological relationships such as food web, nutrient flow, life stage progression and so on. The high elevation areas suggest the need to evaluate the entire West Parcel as a foraging area for raptors and other birds, an initial assessment that can be made a year’s different seasons. Potential bird breeding area can be assessed with interpreted recordings. • Existing databases including Sierra Nevada and other wildlife transects including global warming impact studies require evaluation. | 
I016-13 |
| <p>23. <u>The 1-plus mile or so long north access road and the 1 1/3-plus mile or so south EVA emergency access roads require SP standards, grade delineation and environmental including hazards and winter closure and road safety analysis, including for precautions for the possibility of vehicle departure from the roads.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both diagonally cross steep side slopes and have grades that are not identified and may be steep. • Both routes appear to cross the same earthquake fault (DEIR Exhibit 14-1), and the EVA route may cross two different faults. No fault activity source checking is indicated. • Crossing the steep side slopes with up to 32-foot wide road beds would require deep road cuts with slope and road stability, housing impacts below from road snow removal, and the visual eyesore of major road cut and fill. • The two routes should be compared to other similar road and development access roads, including for winter closure and possibility for regular passenger cars and shuttle vehicles. • Long term winter closure records for Brockway Pass need to be accessed and included in the DEIR. • SP Policy ER-AG-2 needs to address development located below potential avalanche areas. | 
I016-14 |

- Anti public health and safety SP Policy ER-AG-3 to protect building from slope instability instead of prevention structure location in these areas requires environmental and hazard assessment.
- After the barn door SP Policy ER-AG4 for later fault evaluation proposes to excuse knowledge that is necessary to evaluate the environmental impacts that must be known now for the proposed SP and Project and in the DEIR.

IO16-14
cont.

24. The SP Implementation Plan outlines, with much detail left for the future, various processes that would be unique and confusing to people living in the development and to the public and government agencies interested in protect natural resources and the environment. A comparison of what is proposed and current planning and zoning requirements is necessary for all areas including the ones singled out here.

- What other developments or communities have the same or similar overall implementation measures, or the same or similar individual mechanisms?
- Application and removal of elements or all of CEQA.
- Identification of which proposals create ministerial actions.
- The complexity of the proposal would appear to undermine public environmental and other participation. Participation would not be possible without good familiarity with the Martis Valley Community Plan, detailed familiarity with this proposed SP, and knowledge of the administrative processes.
- The process would give the County Chief Executive Officer a major role in planning and development far beyond any prescribed role the Exec has now.
- SP administration, modification, amendment, interpretation, entitlement and other processes.
- The variances now and as proposed.
- Density transfer and if there is such a current authority and where density could be transferred from including from on and off the West Parcel.
- The role of county including environmental review and staffing now and what it is proposed to be.
- Project financing.

IO16-15

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for the extended comment period.

Sincerely,

/S/

Michael Garabedian, President
Friends of the North Fork, Founded 2005
916-719-7296

IO16

Friends of the North Fork
Michael Garabedian, President
December 22, 2015

IO16-1

The comment is prefatory to more detailed comments in the letter. The comment raises general concerns related to the immediate rezone of the timberland production zone (TPZ) on the West Parcel. This issue is expanded upon in subsequent comments in the letter (see responses to comments IO16-5 through IO16-10).

IO16-2

The comment objects to describing the MVWPSP as an exchange. The MVWPSP Project would include transferring development from the East Parcel to the West Parcel, which could be described as an exchange. In this case, the “exchange” consists, not of an exchange of land, but of an exchange in land-use designations and zoning. Thus, portions of the East Parcel are currently designated for residential and commercial uses, and the West Parcel is designated for forest and open space uses. Under this “exchange,” the residential and commercial designations on the East Parcel would be exchanged for – or transferred to – the forest designations on the West Parcel. In the process, the amount of residential development that would be authorized would be reduced. In this respect, the MVWPSP does operate as an “exchange.” However, the MVWPSP is not specifically described as an “exchange” relative to TPZ. Rather, as stated in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR:

The MVWPSP is a proposed plan that would direct the development of residential and commercial uses on a portion of the West Parcel, and the project would permanently preserve the East Parcel as open space. The MVWPSP proposes the transfer of 760 units and 6.6 acres of commercial from the designated development of 1,360 units and 6.6 acres of commercial on the East Parcel (under the existing Martis Valley Community Plan [MVCP]) to the West Parcel. A portion of the West Parcel (662 acres) would be rezoned from Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) to Residential, allowing for the development of residential units and associated commercial, homeowner amenities, and small community retail uses. The remaining 390 acres on the West Parcel would remain designated Forest and would be zoned TPZ. The MVWPSP provides a comprehensive set of goals and policies, project objectives and implementation measures to guide the development of the West Parcel, and establishes Development Standards for parcel layout, buildings, and facilities, as well as Design Guidelines for architecture, landscaping, and other project elements.

A component of the MVWPSP is the conservation of the East Parcel. The MVWPSP proposes the permanent retirement of 600 allowable units and redesignation of the 670 acres of the East Parcel currently zoned for development to Forest. The mechanism for preserving the East Parcel would consist of either (1) sale of the East Parcel to a land trust or similar organization, or (2) recordation of a conservation easement restricting use of the East Parcel.

The conversion of forest land and TPZ is analyzed in the Draft EIR in Chapter 5, “Land Use and Forest Resources” (see Impacts 5-4 and 5-5, pages 5-23 through 5-28). As discussed therein, all Forest-designated lands under the MVWPSP would be zoned TPZ, resulting in an increase of 8 acres with TPZ zoning (with the 670-acre Residential and Commercial area of the East Parcel being designated TPZ and the 662-acre West Parcel development area being immediately rezoned to SPL-MVWPSP).

The comment also suggests that the project is inconsistent with the Placer County General Plan, because the West Parcel is currently designated Forest and zoned TPZ. As a proposed Specific Plan, the action being considered by Placer County is a planning action: redesignation of land uses, rezoning of lands, and preservation of lands. If the County does

not approve the project, then the land will not be redesignated, and the project will not be consistent with the General Plan. If the County does approve the project, then the General Plan will be amended such that the project is consistent with it. The commenter is opposed to such a change in land-use policy. This opposition will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for its consideration. See also response to comment IO18-5. In addition, please see Impacts 5-4 and 5-5 in Chapter 5, “Land Use and Forest Resources,” of the Draft EIR for analysis of impacts to available timber production lands and project-related tree removal.

The comment is generally critical of the specific plan and suggests that management of the project has been insufficient. Please see Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR, specifically Section 1.6, “Environmental Review Process and Public Involvement.” Further, the subject of the County’s approval decision is the MVWPSP, including policies calling for conservation of the entire East Parcel, which is addressed in the EIR. The nature of a specific plan is comprehensive planning and zoning for a defined geographic area. When subsequent activities in the Specific Plan are proposed, the County will determine whether the environmental effects of those activities were adequately addressed in the program EIR and/or whether additional environmental documents must be prepared. Prior to approval of entitlements to develop, those actions or entitlements will be reviewed to determine if they are within the scope of the program EIR, or if additional environmental analysis is needed prior to consideration. If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a project-specific CEQA document would be required. The project-level CEQA documents may incorporate by reference general discussions from the broader EIR and focus on the impacts of the individual projects that implement the plan, program, or policy.

The comment also states that the project would be administered at public expense. To date, the applicant has reimbursed the County for staff time related to the proposed project and for preparation of the EIR by an environmental consultant under contract to the County. Ultimately, the project development would pay applicable fees and taxes, which would be used to provide services to project residents.

IO16-3

The comment states that the Draft EIR should include development of the East Parcel as an alternative. The Draft EIR includes an analysis of development on the East Parcel. As described on page 19-9 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 2 is the No Project – Martis Valley Community Plan Alternative, which assumes development in accordance with existing land use designations and zoning under the existing Martis Valley Community Plan. This would include up to 1,360 residential units and up to 6.6 acres of commercial on the East Parcel; timber harvest in compliance with existing Timber Harvest Permits; and cessation of unauthorized recreational uses (because of liability issues). Analysis of this alternative is found in Section 19.5 of the Draft EIR (see “Alternative 2, the No Project – MVCP Alternative” at page 19-13). As discussed on page 19-36 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 2 would result in a larger footprint of development on the East Parcel, resulting in greater impacts.

The commitment to preserve the East Parcel is a central component of the Specific Plan. For this reason, the Specific Plan includes policies ensuring that, if the Specific Plan is approved, the entire East Parcel would be permanently preserved as open space. This would be ensured initially by Specific Plan Policy OS-3, which requires that the East Parcel be preserved as permanent open space by August 2020. Ultimately, the preferred mechanism for the preservation is acquisition by a land trust. As described on page 3-11 of the Draft EIR:

The mechanism for preserving the East Parcel would consist of either (1) the sale of the East Parcel to a land trust or similar organization, or (2) recordation of a conservation easement restricting its use. The sale of or recordation of a conservation easement on the East Parcel would be carried out by private parties, and does not require approval or action by Nevada or Placer Counties. Nonetheless, the commitment to preserve the East Parcel is a central component of the Specific

Plan. For this reason, the Specific Plan includes policies ensuring that, if the Specific Plan is approved, the entire East Parcel would be permanently preserved as open space. These policies are included in Chapters 3 and 6 of the MVWPSP (Policies LU-2.2, LU-2.3, and OS-2). If the East Parcel is not acquired by a land trust by August 2020, then a limited conservation easement that prohibits residential or retail commercial development on the East Parcel would be placed on the entire 6,376 acres. However, the August 2020 deadline may be administratively extended by the Planning Director if all parties to a purchase and sale agreement agree that an extension is appropriate, and the Planning Director finds that the extension facilitates acquisition and would not result in development of East Parcel.

A key policy consideration for the Board of Supervisors will be the relative merits of allowing development on the East Parcel, as authorized under the Martis Valley Community Plan, or the West Parcel, as proposed by the applicant. The commenter's preference for allowing development on the East Parcel, rather than on the West Parcel, is noted. This comment will be available to the Board at the time it makes its decision.

IO16-4 As stated in the comment, the minor boundary line adjustment has already been approved by the County and a CEQA exemption was prepared. The approved boundary line adjustment is not part of the MVWPSP project.

The West Parcel assessor's parcel numbers are shown in Figure 1-5 of the Specific Plan, available on the County's website:
<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/martisvalleywestparcelproject/martisvalleywestparceldraftsp>.

The comment also states that minor boundary line adjustments (MBLAs) have created eyesores in other locations. The MBLA recently approved by Placer County did not include any entitlements or permits for development. The visual effects of the MVWPSP are fully evaluated in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR.

IO16-5 The comment lists concerns regarding the Specific Plan language, some of which are general statements without specifics regarding the perceived deficiencies. The comment also serves as an introduction to the more detailed comments that follow. See responses below to the detailed comments provided in the letter. All of the items in the comment's bulleted list are disclosed and analyzed in the Draft EIR.

With regard to the comment that the MVWPSP only proposes one year-round resident access road, the MVWPSP also proposes a maintained year-round emergency access road, both of which meet the ingress and egress road standards for fire equipment access adopted pursuant to PRC Section 4290. Furthermore, a secondary, seasonal emergency vehicle access (EVA) would connect to the Fibreboard Freeway, and would be limited to emergency vehicle and emergency provider mandated evacuation. See Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR, page 3-29 "Fire and Life Safety."

The environmental review process and public involvement elements of the project are described in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR, specifically Section 1.6, "Environmental Review Process and Public Involvement."

The comment states the MVWPSP is difficult to understand. To the extent comments raise specific questions about the MVWPSP, this EIR responds to such questions. To the extent comments do not address specific content, analysis, or conclusions of in the Draft EIR, a response cannot be provided. However, it should be noted that the Draft EIR Executive Summary (Chapter 2) and Project Description (Chapter 3) provide a summary and more detailed description, respectively, of the proposed MVWPSP in lay language. In addition, the

complete Draft MVWPSP, the Draft EIR, and the NOP and Initial Study are available for review on the County's website:
<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/martisvalleywestparcelproject/martisvalleywestparceldraftsp>. Furthermore, the comment does not provide evidence regarding the inadequacy of the Draft EIR. Recirculation of the Draft EIR is not warranted, as explained in Master Response 1.

IO16-6

The comment suggests that a new Draft EIR is needed, but could be avoided if the project is denied or withdrawn. The comment is correct that, if the project is withdrawn or disapproved, then CEQA is not applicable, and a new Draft EIR is not needed.

The specific points in the comment address the Specific Plan itself, rather than adequacy of the Draft EIR. The County decision makers will consider this information in their deliberations regarding approval of the project. Where these comments are addressed by existing analysis or information in the Draft EIR, such sections, subsections, and/or pages are cited below. Although the comments do not address the adequacy of the EIR, the following responses are provided for the readers' information.

1. The MVWPSP was prepared by consultants for the applicant. Table 8-1 in Chapter 8 of the Specific Plan identifies the authors of the various reports used to support the Specific Plan. The version of the MVWPSP provided on the County website has a cover. There is no title page in the MVWPSP.
2. Several environmental studies were used in preparation of the MVWPSP generally, and in identification of the buffer shown in Figure 3-3 and described in Policy LU-3.5 on page 25 of the MVWPSP. See also Chapter 7, "Biological Resources," of the Draft EIR. Section 7.3.2, Methods and Assumptions, of that chapter discusses how the analysis considers the potential for the MVWPSP to result in impacts to biological resources in light of the Development Standards and Design Guidelines designed to minimize environmental effects.
3. Specific Plan Figure 5-4 shows the watershed for both the West and East parcels. Specific Plan Figure 7-3 focuses on the topography of the West Parcel, because steep slopes are a constraint to development, and all development under the MVWPSP would be located on the West Parcel. Exhibit 14-2 of the Draft EIR shows the slopes of both the East and West Parcels. Also see Draft EIR Exhibit 15-1 for a watershed map covering both the East and West Parcels.
4. The comment identifies the populations and elevations of local communities in the project vicinity. The comment is noted.
5. The West Parcel is located southeast of Northstar and is therefore more proximate to existing development and utilities than the East Parcel. Residents of any development with access on SR 267 would need to use SR 267 to drive to Northstar (for example, if the East Parcel were to be developed, the access point would be on SR 267).
6. The grades for the primary access road and primary EVA would vary; however, both roads would be built to applicable County standards.
7. The permanency of the East Parcel as open space would be ensured initially by Specific Plan Policy OS-3, which requires that the East Parcel be preserved as permanent open space by August 2020. Ultimately, the preferred mechanism for the preservation is acquisition by a land trust. The permanent conservation of the East Parcel is described in Draft EIR Chapter 3, pages 3-9 through 3-11. Also, see response to comment IO16-3, above.

8. The comment appears to be addressing MVCP Policy 1.f.1, which is included in the Guiding Goals and Objectives on page 18 of the MVWPSP. The policy encourages the sustained use of forestland as *a means of providing open space* (emphasis added). The project would further Policy 1.f.1 of the MVCP by preserving 6,420 acres in open space. This land would be zoned TPZ, which does allow forestry. The policy does not require the productive use of forestland, and does not refer to “all forestland” as stated in the comment. The conversion of forest land and TPZ is analyzed in the Draft EIR in Chapter 5, “Land Use and Forest Resources” (see Impacts 5-4 and 5-5, pages 5-23 through 5-28). As discussed therein, all Forest-designated lands under the MVWPSP would be zoned TPZ, resulting in an increase of 8 acres with TPZ zoning (with the 670-acre Residential and Commercial area of the East Parcel being designated TPZ and the 662-acre West Parcel development area being immediately rezoned to SPL-MVWPSP). With implementation of approved THPs, timber harvesting would be allowed on these lands. Compatibility of the MVWPSP with surrounding land uses is also addressed in Draft EIR Impact 5-2 (pages 5-19 through 5-21).
9. The uses allowed within the TPZ on the West Parcel are consistent with the existing TPZ zoning per the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.
10. The exemption of employee housing from density calculations is consistent with the Placer County Code and is used for purposes of determining whether a proposed development is consistent with the densities assigned to a particular zone. This determination does not alter the need to evaluate the impacts of such housing if it is included in a proposed development. As discussed in response to comment LA6-1, the applicant no longer proposes a fee in lieu under the Workforce Housing Plan. Consistent with Placer County General Plan Policy C-2, a dedication of land for employee housing within the MVWP is proposed. The employee housing site located on this land could contain up to 21 units. Those units would be subtracted from the total proposed unit count of 760 for the proposed development, so the total number of units allowed within the specific plan area would not exceed 760. Therefore, the project does not propose to take advantage of the provision exempting employee housing from the density calculations, and the impacts of the proposed affordable housing land dedication have been fully analyzed in this Draft EIR (because the total unit count and disturbed acreage would not change).
11. As individual tentative maps are proposed, they would indicate whether roads would be gated, and, if applicable, how public access to trails would be maintained. The County would review the proposals to ensure they meet County standards and Specific Plan Policy OS-5 (provide public access to trails).
12. A primary road is needed to connect the internal circulation system to SR 267. A primary EVA is required to ensure that there are two year-round, all weather access routes into the plan area. A secondary EVA is not required, but is proposed in case there is a need during, for example, evacuation. The internal roadways would provide access to the primary road or EVA.
13. Policy PSU-13 is consistent with Placer County General Plan Policy 6.A.1, which does not address intermittent episodic water courses. As shown in Exhibit 7-2a of the Draft EIR, no ephemeral streams were identified on the West Parcel.
14. Fire, Life Safety, and Law Enforcement are discussed together in the Specific Plan because they all address public safety. The information provided about each would be the same whether they were discussed together, as on page 57 of the MVWPSP, or under separate headings. Chapter 17, “Public Services and Recreation,” and Chapter 18, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials,” of the Draft EIR describe fire protection services

separate from law enforcement and evaluate the project's impact on fire protection services and wildfire hazards. Existing community wildfire protection plans and fire safe regulations are also described.

15. See response to comment LA2-2 and Master Response 9. Exhibit 9-26 is a conceptual site plan used to model potential placement of structures for the visual resources assessment. The conceptual plan illustrates one scenario of how the Specific Plan could be implemented based on zoning, site conditions, and development restrictions. The Specific Plan provides flexibility regarding the location of single-family, multifamily and commercial development within the Residential zone. As disclosed in the Draft EIR, the proposed project could ultimately differ from the conceptual plan shown in Exhibit 3-7.

16. See response to comment LA2-2 and Master Response 9.

IO16-7

The conversion of forest land and timber harvest zone is analyzed in the Draft EIR in Chapter 5, "Land Use and Forest Resources;" see Impacts 5-4 and 5-5. As discussed therein, all Forest-designated lands under the MVWPSP would be zoned TPZ, resulting in an increase of 8 acres zoned TPZ (with the 670-acre Residential and Commercial area of the East Parcel being designated TPZ and the 662-acre West Parcel development area being immediately rezoned to SPL-MVWPSP). With implementation of approved THPs, timber harvesting would be allowed on these lands. Compatibility of the MVWPSP with surrounding land uses is also addressed in Draft EIR Impact 5-2.

Pages 5-10 and 5-11 of the Draft EIR discuss the California Timberland Productivity Act and the procedures related to an immediate rezoning of TPZ lands (Sections 51130-51146). Immediate rezoning (as opposed to elapse of the 10-year period to which TPZ lands are committed to timber harvesting activities) requires public notice, a hearing, a four-fifths vote of the full body of the County Board of Supervisors (to tentatively approve the rezoning), and the adoption of specified findings. The immediate rezone of the West Parcel from TPZ to SPL-MVWPSP would require a Timber Conversion Plan, subject to approval by the County Board of Supervisors and California Board of Forestry (through CAL FIRE). The Board's tentative approval accompanied by specific written findings would then be forwarded to the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection for consideration and approval pursuant to Section 4621.2 of the Public Resources Code. Upon final approval of conversion, the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection would notify the Board of Supervisors of the approval, which would then remove the parcel from TPZ and specify new zoning. In addition, please see response to comment IO16-2, which addresses issues of consistency of the MVWPSP with the General Plan.

The findings to support an immediate rezoning of TPZ lands are not required to be part of the EIR. Rather, the County Board of Supervisors will make the necessary findings to support immediate rezoning of TPZ lands based on the MVWPSP EIR, after certification. The evidence in support of those findings may be in the EIR, or the evidence may be elsewhere in the record. The TPZ findings are similar to the Board's decision related to the General Plan consistency: the EIR analysis identifies consistencies and/or inconsistencies, but the ultimate determination of consistency rests with the legislative body. To clarify the necessary findings, the text of page 5-11 of the Draft EIR (under the heading "California Timberland Productivity Act of 1982") is hereby revised as follows:

The Timberland Productivity Act describes the procedures related to immediate rezoning of TPZ lands (Sections 51130-51146). Immediate rezoning (as opposed to elapse of the 10-year period to which TPZ lands are committed to timber harvesting activities) requires public notice, a hearing, and a four-fifths vote of the full body of the County Board of Supervisors (or council) to tentatively approve the rezoning. The Board's tentative approval, accompanied by the following specific written findings,

would then be forwarded to the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection for consideration and approval pursuant to Section 4621.2 of the Public Resources Code. The findings must address that all of the following exist:

1. The immediate rezoning would be in the public interest.
2. The immediate rezoning does not have a substantial and unmitigated adverse effect upon the continued timber growing use or open space use of other land zoned as timberland production and situated within one mile of the exterior boundary of the land on which the immediate rezoning is proposed.
3. The soils, slopes, and watershed conditions will be suitable for the uses proposed by the applicant if the immediate rezoning is approved.
4. The immediate rezoning is not inconsistent with the purposes of subdivision (j) of section 3 of Article XIII of the California Constitution.

Upon final approval of conversion, the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection would notify the Board of the approval, and the Board would remove the parcel from TPZ and specify new zoning.

Analysis of project-related impacts to other related environmental resources, such as biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and recreation are addressed throughout the environmental resource chapters of the Draft EIR (Chapters 5 through 18).

IO16-8 The comment asserts that the Draft EIR did not evaluate the MVWPSP's consistency with the General Plan. See response to comments IO18-3 and IO18-5, regarding the project description and conceptual site plan and consistency with the Placer County General Plan and Martis Valley Community Plan.

The comment notes Placer County General Plan Policy 7.E.1, which encourages the sustained productive use of forest land as a means of providing open space and conserving other natural resources. This is consistent with MVCP Policy 1.f.1, which is included in the Guiding Goals and Objectives on page 18 of the MVWPSP. The project would further Policy 1.f.1 of the MVCP by preserving 6,420 acres in open space.

The comment also cites General Plan Policy 7.E.2, which discourages development that conflicts with timberland management. Please see response to comment IO16-7, above, which explains that the conversion of forest land and timber harvest zone is analyzed in the Draft EIR in Chapter 5, "Land Use and Forest Resources;" see Impacts 5-4 and 5-5, which discusses the California Timberland Productivity Act and the procedures related to an immediate rezoning of TPZ lands (Sections 51130-51146).

IO16-9 The comment states that the Specific Plan does not make the necessary findings required for immediate rezone of TPZ. See response to comment IO-16-7, above, regarding analysis of the immediate rezoning of TPZ proposed by the MVWPSP. The applicable findings to support an immediate rezone of TPZ must be adopted by the Board of Supervisors. These findings may be based on information in the Specific Plan, or in the EIR, or elsewhere in the record.

IO16-10 The comment asserts that a 10-year TPZ rollout is inconsistent with the General Plan. The MVWPSP does not propose a 10-year TPZ rollout, but rather proposes an immediate rezone of TPZ on the West Parcel. See response to comment IO16-7, above, regarding analysis of the immediate rezoning of TPZ proposed by the MVWPSP.

The comment also states that the TPZ rezone would develop remote forest lands with timber, biological, and scenic resources, and that wildfire would be a threat. See Master Response 9 regarding wildland fire. The biological impacts of developing the project site are addressed in Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR, and visual resources are addressed in Chapter 9

Also, the project site is not particularly “remote” as it is located in proximity to a major roadway (SR 267) and developed ski resort (Northstar), and is leased by Vail for its guests to use the cross-country ski and hiking trails.

- IO16-11 The comment suggests that visual impacts from existing trails, such as the Tahoe Rim Trail were not evaluated in the Draft EIR. See response to comment IO18-52 regarding visual impacts from existing trails and views from the Tahoe Rim Trail.
- IO16-12 The comment suggests that the Draft EIR provide graphics of the proposed structures and building heights. See response to comment IO18-3, regarding the project description and conceptual site plan. See page 3-18, Table 3-3, and Exhibit 3-8 in Chapter 3, “Project Description,” of the Draft EIR for description of the maximum proposed building heights (also see Development Standards in Appendix B of the Specific Plan).
- IO16-13 The comment asserts that there is no basis for the Specific Plan to state that habitat would be protected by designating the East Parcel and a portion of the West Parcel as Forest. Permitted uses on land that is designated Forest are set forth in the Martis Valley Community Plan. Permitted uses under the “Forest” designation are set forth at page 25 of the MVCP, which states: “Typical land uses allowed include: commercial timber production operations and facilities; recreation uses such as skiing and skiing related facilities, such as skier services including parking, incidental camping, private, institutional and commercial campgrounds (but not recreational vehicle parks); and necessary public utility and safety facilities.”, and in Appendix A of the MVWPSP. Residential and commercial uses are not permitted in land that is designated Forest.
- As explained in the Draft EIR and in response to comment IO16-3, above, the commitment to preserve the East Parcel is a central component of the Specific Plan. Chapter 7, “Biological Resources,” of the Draft EIR describes common and sensitive biological vegetation, terrestrial wildlife, and aquatic biological resources known or with potential to occur within the MVWPSP project site, and describes potential effects of project implementation on those resources. Biological resources include common vegetation and habitat types, sensitive plant communities, and special-status plant and animal species. In response to specific concerns regarding deer migration, please see Impact 7-5, which discusses the project-related impacts to mule deer (the Loyalton-Truckee deer herd).
- Chapter 12 of the Draft EIR, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, presents a summary of the current state of climate change science and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions sources in California; a summary of applicable regulations; quantification of project-generated GHG emissions and discussion about their potential contribution to global climate change; and analysis of the project’s resiliency to climate-change-related risks. See Section 12.1.2 for a discussion of effects of climate change on the environment. Although it is unclear what is meant by the last bullet in this comment, a review of potential impacts, if they exist, of climate change on local wildlife, including review of existing databases and transect studies would not be caused or exacerbated by the project.
- IO16-14 The comment lists concerns related to roadways (including the EVA), slopes, and environmental hazards, focusing on the Specific Plan, but also raising some connections to the Draft EIR. All project roads would be built to applicable County standards as well as fire and life safety requirements. See response to comment IO18-3 for response to concerns regarding review of a Specific Plan and conceptual land use plan.

Specific concerns related to environmental review of geologic hazards (including faults and avalanches) are evaluated in Chapter 14, “Geology and Soils.” The visual impacts of the project, including project roadways, are analyzed in Chapter 9, “Visual Resources,” of the Draft EIR.

IO16-15

The comment asserts that the MVWPSP Implementation Plan contains insufficient detail and would be confusing to residents, the public, and interested agencies. See response to comment IO18-3, which explains that the content and level of detail of the MVWPSP is sufficient for a specific plan and that the project description is in compliance with CEQA requirements. Response IO18-3 also explains that the intent of the EIR, if certified, is to serve as the base environmental document for subsequent entitlement approvals within the West Parcel. Second, the environmental review process and public involvement are described in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR, specifically see Section 1.6, “Environmental Review Process and Public Involvement.” In addition, see response to comment IO16 -2, above, which discusses the Draft EIR analysis of land use changes, zoning changes, and consistency with the Placer County General Plan and MVCP.

Finally, the comment mentions “project financing.” CEQA is intended to evaluate whether proposed actions would have an adverse impact on the environment; there is no requirement to analyze the financial feasibility of the project.



IO17

November 2, 2015

Placer County
Environmental Coordination Services
Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Ste. 190
Auburn, CA 95603
cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Subject: Martis Valley West Specific Plan draft Environmental Impact Report – Request for extension of public comment period and correction related to public comments on NOP

Dear Ms. Jacobsen:

The Friends of the West Shore (FOWS) respectfully requests an extension of the public comment period for the Martis Valley West Parcel Specific Plan (MVWSP) draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) by fifteen days (thereby ending on December 22, 2015), to afford the public a full sixty days to review and comment on the thousands of pages which comprise the DEIR. Notably, the project has already been the subject of a confusing public process, as follows:

- Two Notices of Preparation (NOP) have been released (2014 and 2015);
 - Additionally, as noted in our comments on the February 2015 NOP,¹ the project description is incorrect as it assumes a boundary line amendment that did not occur;
- The first NOP proposed the development of land within the Tahoe Basin while the second NOP claimed Tahoe land had been removed, yet the project description inappropriately assumed a different Tahoe Basin boundary line;
- In the meantime, an application for a boundary line amendment was submitted then later withdrawn, followed by a parcel line amendment in September 2015;
- The MVWSP is based on a land exchange concept that has been in discussion for years and originally did not involve development in the Tahoe Basin (a fact recently reiterated by the two environmental organizations subject to these negotiations²); and
- The in-Basin land that has been at times included and excluded has also been the subject of an unclear process involving a proposed TRPA Area Plan and currently, a 550-unit campground.

The location, configuration, and project area associated with this project have been a moving target. The public should be afforded ample time to review the extensive and lengthy DEIR in order to clearly understand what the proposed project entails and what impacts may occur to the Tahoe Basin.

In addition, the DEIR fails to include all of the comments submitted on the February 2015 NOP. FOWS submitted two letters (including one from Lozeau Drury LLP) and Placer County acknowledged receipt, yet it appears our comments on the NOP were not considered in the DEIR (nor are they listed in *Table B-1: Comments Received on the Revised 2015 Notice of Preparation* [App. B; attached]). This also raises the question of whether other organization or individual comments have also been left out of the package. We hope you will consider our request, as well as provide the public with all comments submitted on the NOP. Please feel free to contact Jennifer Quashnick at jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Susan Gearhart,
President

Jennifer Quashnick,
Conservation Consultant

¹ <http://friendswestshore.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/2015.03.27-Lozeau-Drury-FOWS-NOP-Scoping-Comments-Final-1.pdf>; and <http://friendswestshore.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/FOWS-Additional-Comments-on-MVW-NOP-3.28.pdf>

² <http://www.sierrasun.com/news/18771829-113/opinion-setting-the-record-straight-regarding-martis-valley>

IO17-1

Table B-1 Comments Received on the Revised 2015 Notice of Preparation			
Name of Author	Agency / Organization	Date Post Marked/ Received	Relevant EIR Section(s)
AGENCIES			
State			
Susan Zanchi, Chief	California Department of Transportation, District 3, Office of Transportation Planning- North	March 30, 2015	Traffic Utilities
Regional / Local			
Brandy McMahon, AICP	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	March 30, 2015	Visual Resources
Jason A. Parker, Engineering Department Manager	Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency	March 20, 2015	Utilities
ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS			
Organizations			
Ann Nichols	North Tahoe Preservation Alliance	March 29, 2015	Project Description Cumulative Impacts Biological Resources Climate Change Land Use/Forestry
Terry Davis, Director	Sierra Club Mother Lode Chapter	March 30, 2015	Project Description Visual Resources Land Use/Forestry Resources Cumulative Impacts Hazards (Fire)
Laurel Ames, Chair	Sierra Club Tahoe Area Sierra Club Group	March 30, 2015	Project Description Land Use Traffic Visual Resources Biological Resources Recreation
Shannon Eckmeyer, Policy Analyst	League to Save Lake Tahoe	March 24, 2015	Visual Resources Traffic Project Description Land Use
Individuals			
Rosie Mann	–	March 15, 2015	Climate Change Cumulative Impacts Biological Resources Utilities – Water
Gwen Rosser	Tahoe Vista resident	March 23, 2015	Land Use/Forestry Visual Resources Recreation Traffic Air Quality Climate Change
Ellie Waller	Tahoe Vista resident	March 16, 2015	Visual Resources

Table B-1 Comments Received on the Revised 2015 Notice of Preparation			
Name of Author	Agency / Organization	Date Post Marked/ Received	Relevant EIR Section(s)
Ellie Waller	Tahoe Vista resident	March 26, 2015	Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program Air Quality Biological Resources Cultural Resources Visual Resources Noise Hydrology/Water Quality Traffic Land Use/Forestry Utilities – Water Hazards (Fire) Recreation
Ellie Waller	Tahoe Vista resident	March 16, 2015	Project Description Land Use/Forestry Visual Resources Public Services/Recreation Population/Employment/Housing Biological Resources Utilities Hydrology/Water Quality Hazards Energy Use Traffic Air Quality Climate Change Noise Cultural Resources Geology/Soils/Seismicity Cumulative Impacts Alternatives

Table B-2 Comments Received on the Original 2014 Notice of Preparation			
Name of Author	Agency / Organization	Date Post Marked/ Received	Relevant EIR Section(s)
AGENCIES			
State			
Scott Morgan, Director	California State Clearinghouse	March 28, 2014	N/A
Brad Harris, Unit Chief	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection	April 11, 2014	Land Use/Forestry
Marlo Tinney, Chief	California Department of Transportation, District 3 Office of Transportation Planning - East	April 28, 2014	Traffic Utilities Biological Resources Visual Resources

IO17

Friends of the West Shore
Susan Gearhart and Jennifer Quashnick
November 2, 2015

IO17-1

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period for the Draft EIR by 15 days. The Draft EIR was released on October 22, 2015 for public review and comment for a 45-day period (ending December 7, 2015). The Draft EIR comment period was extended by 15 days for a total review period of 60 days, ending December 22, 2015 (as identified on the County's website). Regarding the comment about the letters submitted on the Notice of Preparation, see response to comment IO18-82.

This page intentionally left blank.